

EPA 910-R-02-006

**COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN
FISH CONTAMINANT SURVEY
1996-1998**

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 10
Seattle, Washington 98101

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	i
List of Tables	vi
List of Figure	xiv
Acknowledgment	xx
Contributors	xxii
Columbia River Basin Fish Contaminant Study Workgroup	xxiii
List of Abbreviations and Acronyms	xxiv
Units	xxv
Executive Summary	E-1
1.0 Introduction	1-1
1.1 Report Organization	1-1
1.2 Study Background	1-1
1.3 Study Area	1-3
1.4 Sampling Locations	1-3
1.5 Fish Species	1-7
1.6 Sampling Methods	1-9
1.7 Chemical Analysis	1-10
1.7.1 PCB analysis	1-12
1.7.2 Mercury and Arsenic analysis	1-12
1.7.3 Total Chlordane and Total DDT	1-12
1.7.4 Lead Risk Characterization	1-13
1.7.5 Data Quality Validation of Chemical Analyses	1-13
1.7.6 Detection limits	1-14
1.7.7 Statistical Data Summaries	1-14
1.8 Lipid Analysis	1-15
1.9 Special Studies	1-15
1.9.1 Channel Catfish and Smallmouth Bass	1-15
1.9.2 Acid-Labile Pesticides	1-16
1.9.3 Radionuclide analyses	1-16
2.0 Fish Tissue Chemical Concentrations	2-18
2.1 Percent Lipid	2-18
2.2 Semi-Volatile Chemicals	2-19
2.3 Pesticides	2-21
2.3.1 DDMU, Hexachlorobenzene, Aldrin, Pentachloroanisole, and Mirex	2-21
2.3.2 Total Chlordane	2-23
2.3.3 Total DDT	2-24
2.4 Aroclors	2-29
2.5 Dioxin-Like PCB congeners	2-33
2.6 Chlorinated Dioxins and Furans	2-35

2.7	Toxicity Equivalence Concentrations of Chlorinated Dioxins and Furans, and Dioxin-Like PCB congeners	2-39
2.8	Metals	2-40
2.8.1	Arsenic	2-44
2.8.2	Mercury	2-48
3.0	Human Health Risk Assessment	3-51
4.0	Exposure Assessment	4-52
4.1	Identification of Exposed Populations	4-52
4.2	Exposure Pathway	4-52
4.3	Quantification Of Exposure	4-53
4.4	Exposure Point Concentrations (Chemical Concentrations in Fish)	4-56
4.5	Fish Ingestion Rates	4-57
4.5.1	Fish Ingestion Rates for the General Population	4-57
4.5.2	Fish Ingestion Rates for CRITFC's Member Tribes	4-58
4.6	Exposure Frequency	4-60
4.7	Exposure Duration	4-60
4.7.1	Adults	4-60
4.7.2	Children	4-61
4.8	Body Weight	4-61
4.8.1	Adults	4-61
4.8.2	Children	4-61
4.9	Averaging Time	4-62
4.10	Multiple-Species Diet Exposures	4-62
5.0	Toxicity Assessment	5-65
5.1	Summary of Toxicity Assessment for Non-Cancer Health Effects	5-66
5.2	Summary of Toxicity Assessment for Cancer	5-73
5.3	Special Assumptions and Methods Used For Selected Chemicals	5-75
5.3.1	Non-Cancer Toxicity Values for Chlordanes, DDT/DDE/DDD, and Aroclors	5-75
5.3.2	Cancer Toxicity for Chlorinated Dioxins/Furans, Dioxin-Like PCB congeners, and PAHs	5-76
5.3.3	Arsenic Toxicity	5-77
6.0	Risk Characterization	6-83
6.1	Risk Characterization Methodology	6-83
6.1.1	Non-Cancer Health Effects	6-83
6.1.2	Cancer Risk Assessment	6-84
6.1.3	Chemicals Not Evaluated	6-86
6.1.4	Arsenic	6-86
6.1.5	Sample Type	6-86
6.2	Risk Characterization Results	6-87
6.2.1	Non-Cancer Hazard Evaluation	6-88

6.2.1.1	Non-Cancer Hazard Evaluation for Resident Fish	6-88
6.2.1.2	Non-cancer Hazard Evaluation for Anadromous Fish	6-104
6.2.1.3	Comparisons Between Anadromous Fish and Resident Fish Species	6-112
6.2.2	Cancer Risk Evaluation	6-115
6.2.2.1	Cancer Risk Evaluation for Resident Fish	6-116
6.2.2.2	Cancer Risk Evaluation for Anadromous Fish	6-129
6.2.2.3	Comparisons of Cancer Risks Between Anadromous Fish and Resident Fish Species	6-137
6.2.3	Summary of Non-Cancer Hazards and Cancer Risks for All Species	6-140
6.2.4	Impacts of Sample Type on Risk Characterization	6-143
6.2.5	Risk Characterization Using a Multiple-species Diet	6-144
6.2.6	Risk Characterization Using Different Assumptions for Percent of Inorganic Arsenic	6-147
7.0	Lead Risk Assessment	7-151
7.1	Lead Concentrations in Fish	7-151
7.2	Overview of Lead Risk Assessment Approach	7-152
7.3	Method for Predicting Risks to Children	7-153
7.4	Risk Characterization for Children	7-157
7.5	Uncertainties in risk estimates for Children	7-158
7.6	Method for Predicting Risks to Fetuses	7-159
7.7	Risk Characterization for Fetuses	7-161
7.8	Uncertainty Analysis for Risk to Fetuses	7-162
7.9	Conclusions	7-162
8.0	Radionuclide Assessment	8-163
8.1	Radionuclide Data Reporting and Use	8-163
8.2	General Information on Radiation Risk	8-164
8.3	Risk Calculations	8-165
8.4	Composite Study site Results	8-167
8.4.1	Potassium-40 Results	8-167
8.5	Background	8-167
8.6	Uncertainties	8-170
8.7	Discussion	8-170
8.8	Conclusions	8-171
9.0	Comparisons of Fish Tissue Chemical Concentrations	9-172
9.1	Comparison by Chemical Concentration	9-172
9.1.1	Chlordane	9-172
9.1.2	Total DDT	9-172
9.1.3	PCBs	9-173
9.1.4	Chlorinated Dioxins and Furans	9-177
9.1.5	Metals	9-178

9.1.6	Aluminum	9-178
9.1.7	Arsenic	9-179
9.1.8	Cadmium	9-180
9.1.9	Chromium	9-180
9.1.10	Copper	9-181
9.1.11	Lead	9-182
9.1.12	Mercury	9-183
9.1.13	Nickel	9-186
9.1.14	Selenium	9-187
9.1.15	Vanadium	9-189
9.1.16	Zinc	9-189
9.2	Comparisons By Fish Species	9-190
9.2.1	Largescale Sucker (<i>Catostomus macrocheilus</i>) and Bridgelip Sucker (<i>C. columbianus</i>)	9-192
9.2.2	Mountain Whitefish (<i>Prosopium williamsoni</i>)	9-195
9.2.3	White Sturgeon (<i>Acipenser transmontanus</i>)	9-196
9.2.4	Walleye (<i>Stizostedion vitreum</i>)	9-196
9.2.5	Channel catfish (<i>Ictalurus punctatus</i>)	9-197
9.2.6	Smallmouth Bass (<i>Micropterus dolomieu</i>)	9-198
9.2.7	Rainbow and Steelhead (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>)	9-199
9.2.8	Chinook Salmon (<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>)	9-200
9.2.9	Coho Salmon (<i>Oncorhynchus kisutch</i>)	9-201
9.2.10	Pacific Lamprey (<i>Lampetra tridentata</i>)	9-202
9.2.11	Eulachon (<i>Thaleichthys pacificus</i>)	9-203
9.3	Comparisons across all species	9-203
9.3.1	Resident Fish	9-203
9.3.2	Pacific lamprey and eulachon	9-204
9.3.3	Salmonids	9-205
10.0	Uncertainty Evaluation	10-208
10.1	Fish Tissue Collection	10-208
10.2	Chemical Analyses	10-210
10.2.1	Lipid analyses	10-211
10.3	Comparing Chemical Data Across Fish Species and with Other Studies	10-212
10.4	Risk Assessment	10-212
10.4.1	Exposure Assessment	10-212
10.4.1.1	Contaminant Concentrations in Fish Tissue	10-212
10.4.1.2	Tissue Type	10-213
10.4.1.3	Exposure Duration	10-214
10.4.1.4	Consumption Rate	10-214
10.4.1.5	Multiple-Species Consumption Patterns	10-215
10.4.1.6	Effects of Cooking	10-216
10.4.2	Toxicity Assessment	10-217
10.4.2.1	Toxicity Values	10-217
10.4.2.2	Toxicity Equivalence Factors for Dioxins, Furans, and Dioxin-	

	like PCB Congeners and Relative Potency Factors for PAHs	10-218
	10.4.2.3 Chemicals Without Quantitative Toxicity Factors	10-219
	10.4.2.4 Risk Characterization for PCBs	10-220
	10.4.2.5 Non-Cancer Effects from DDT, DDD, and DDE	10-222
	10.4.2.6 Risk Characterization for Arsenic	10-223
10.4.3	Risk Characterization	10-224
	10.4.3.1 Cancer Risk Estimates	10-224
	10.4.3.2 Non-Cancer Health Effects	10-225
	10.4.3.3 Cumulative Risk from Chemical and Radionuclide Exposure	10-226
10.5	Risk Characterization for Consumption of Fish Eggs	10-226
11.0	Conclusions	11-228
12.0	References	12-230

List of Tables

Table 1-1. Description, study site, sampling location, and river mile for Columbia River Basin fish sampling 1996-1998.	1-6
Table 1-2a. Resident fish species collected from the Columbia River Basin, 1996 -1998.	1-7
Table 1-2b. Anadromous fish species collected from the Columbia River Basin, 1996 -1998.	1-8
Table 1-3. Recent surveys of types of fish consumed by the general public in the Columbia River Basin.	1-9
Table 1-4a. 51 semi-volatile chemicals analyzed.	1-11
Table 1-4b. 26 pesticides analyzed.	1-11
Table 1-4c. 18 Metals analyzed.	1-11
Table 1-4d. 7 Aroclors analyzed	1-11
Table 1-4e. 13 Dioxin-like PCB congeners analyzed.	1-11
Table 1-4f. 7 chlorinated dioxins analyzed.	1-11
Table 1-4g. 10 chlorinated furans analyzed.	1-11
Table 1-5. Sampling study sites and numbers of replicates for survey of chemicals in tissues of smallmouth bass and channel catfish collected in the Columbia River Basin, 1996-1998.	1-16
Table 1-6. AED pesticides detected in fish tissue from the Columbia River Basin, 1996-1998.	1-16
Table 1-7. Radionuclide fish tissue samples including study site, species, and number of replicates from the Columbia River Basin, 1996-1998.	1-17
Table 1-8. The radionuclides analyzed in fish tissue collected in the Columbia River Basin 1996-1998.	1-17
Table 2-1a. Basin-wide composite concentrations* of semi-volatile chemicals detected in resident fish species from the Columbia River Basin, 1996-1998.	2-20

Table 2-1b. Basin-wide composite concentrations* of semi-volatile chemicals detected in anadromous fish species from the Columbia River Basin, 1996-1998.	2-20
Table 2.2a. Basin-wide concentrations of pesticides in resident fish tissue from the Columbia River Basin, 1996-1998.	2-22
Table 2.2b. Basin-wide concentrations of pesticides in anadromous fish tissue from the Columbia River Basin, 1996-1998.	2-23
Table 2-3 . Basin-wide average concentrations of total chlordane (oxy-chlordane, gamma, beta and alpha chlordane, <i>cis</i> and <i>trans</i> nonachlor) in fish from the Columbia River Basin, 1996-1998.	2-24
Table 2-4. Basin-wide average concentrations of total DDT (DDT, DDE, DDD) in composite fish tissue samples from the Columbia River Basin, 1996-1998.	2-25
Table 2-5. Basin-wide average and maximum concentrations of p,p'DDE in composite samples of fish from the Columbia River Basin, 1996-1998.	2-26
Table 2-6. Basin-wide average concentrations of total Aroclors (1242, 1254,1260) detected* in composite fish tissue samples from the Columbia River Basin.	2-29
Table 2-7. Basin-wide average concentrations of the sum of dioxin-like PCB congeners in composite fish samples from the Columbia River Basin, 1996-1998.	2-33
Table 2-8. Basin-wide average concentrations of the sum of chlorinated dioxins and furans in composite fish samples from the Columbia River Basin, 1996-1998.	2-36
Table 2-9a. Basin-wide concentrations of 2,3,7,8-TCDF in composite samples of fish tissue from the Columbia River Basin, 1996-1998.	2-38
Table 2-9b. Basin-wide concentrations of 2,3,7,8-TCDF in composite samples of eggs from anadromous fish species in the Columbia River Basin, 1996-1998.	2-38
Table 2-10. Toxicity Equivalence Factors (TEF) for dioxin-like PCB congeners, dioxins, and furans (from Van den Berg et al., 1998).	2-39
Table 2-11. Basin-wide average concentrations of the toxicity equivalence concentrations for composite fish samples from the Columbia River Basin, 1996-1998.	2-40
Table 2-12. Basin-wide maximum concentrations * of metals in composite fish tissues measured in the Columbian River Basin, 1996 -1998.	2-41
Table 2-13. Basin-wide average concentrations of metals in samples of eggs from anadromous fish collected in the Columbia River Basin, 1996-1998.	2-42

Table 2-14. Basin-wide average concentrations of metals in composite samples of fish from the Columbia River Basin, 1996-1998.	2-43
Table 4-1. Exposure parameters used to calculate average daily dose for assessing noncarcinogenic health effects for potentially exposed populations	4-55
Table 4-2. Exposure parameters used to calculate average daily dose for assessing carcinogenic risks for potentially exposed populations.	4-56
Table 4-3. Fish consumption rates expressed in alternative units.	4-59
Table 4-4. Description of the methodology used to calculate exposure for a multiple-species diet	4-64
Table 5-1. Chemicals without oral reference doses and cancer slope factors.	5-65
Table 5-2. Chemicals contributing to non-cancer hazard indices	5-68
Table 5-3. Oral reference doses (RfDs) used in this assessment, including the level of confidence in the RfD, uncertainty factors (UF) and modifying factor (MF) used to develop the RfD, and the toxic effect(s) from the critical study that the RfD was based upon.	5-71
Table 5-4. EPA weight-of-evidence classifications for carcinogens.	5-73
Table 5-5. Oral cancer slope factors with their weight of evidence classification with the type(s) of tumor the cancer slope factor is based upon.	5-74
Table 5-6. Relative potency factors for PAHs	5-76
Table 5-7a. Results of arsenic (As) analyses from Lower Columbia River Bi-State Water Quality Program	5-79
Table 5-7b. Mean concentrations** of arsenic(As) in all fish species combined	5-79
Table 5-7c. Arithmetic means** of percent inorganic arsenic by species.	5-79
Table 5-8. Summary of Willamette River, speciated arsenic data	5-80
Table 6-1. Total hazard indices (HI) and endpoint specific hazard indices (at or greater than 1.0) for white sturgeon.	6-89
Table 6-2. Comparison of Estimated Total Hazard Indices Among Adult Populations.	6-92

Table 6-3. Comparison of Estimated Total Hazard Indices Among Child Populations	6-93
Table 6-4. Chemicals having hazard quotients at or greater than 1.0 in white sturgeon.	6-96
Table 6-5 Summary of ranges in endpoint specific hazard indices across study sites for adults who consume resident fish from the Columbia River Basin.	6-98
Table 6-6. Percent contribution of contaminant groups to total non-cancer hazards for resident fish species. Based on Columbia River Basin-wide averages.	6-100
Table 6-7 Summary of ranges in endpoint specific hazard indices across study sites for adults who consume anadromous fish species from the Columbia River Basin.	6-106
Table 6-8. Percent contribution of contaminant groups to total non-cancer hazards for anadromous fish species. Based on Columbia River Basin-wide averages.	6-108
Table 6-9. Summary of endpoint specific hazard indices and total hazard indices (by study site and basin-wide) for CRITFC's tribal member adult, high fish consumption.	6-113
Table 6-10. Summary of total estimated cancer risks for white sturgeon.	6-117
Table 6-11. Comparison of estimated total cancer risks among adult populations	6-118
Table 6-12. Chemicals with estimated cancer risks at or greater than 1×10^{-5} for white sturgeon, fillet without skin.	6-121
Table 6-13. Chemicals with estimated cancer risks at or greater than 1×10^{-5} for white sturgeon, whole body.	6-121
Table 6-14. Summary of estimated total cancer risks by study site and basin-wide, resident fish species.	6-122
Table 6-15. Percent contribution of contaminant groups to estimated cancer risks for resident fish species.	6-125
Table 6-16. Summary of estimated total cancer risks by study site and basin-wide, anadromous fish species	6-130
Table 6-17. Percent contribution of contaminant groups to cancer risk for anadromous fish species.	6-133
Table 6-18. Summary of estimated total cancer risks by study site and basin-wide, all species.	6-138
Table 6-19. Summary of Hazard Indices and Cancer Risks Across Study sites.	6-141

Table 6-20. Summary of Hazard Indices and Cancer Risks Across Study sites.	6-142
Table 6-21. Summary of Hazard Indices and Cancer Risks Across Study sites.	6-142
Table 6-22. Summary of Hazard Indices and Cancer Risks Across Study sites.	6-143
Table 6-23. Comparison of site specific non-cancer hazard indices (for CRITFC's member tribal children) and cancer risks (for CRITFC's member tribal adults) from consuming whole body versus fillet for different fish species.	6-144
Table 6-24. Estimate cancer risks and non-cancer health effects for a hypothetical multiple-species diet based upon CRITFC's member average adult fish consumption (CRITFC, 1994)	6-145
Table 6-25. Total hazard indices (HIs) for adults assuming that total arsenic is 1% versus 10% inorganic arsenic	6-148
Table 6-26. Estimated total cancer risks for adults assuming that total arsenic was 1% versus 10% inorganic arsenic 70 years exposure.	6-149
Table 7-1. Default Input Parameters Used for the IEUBK Model Adapted from (USEPA,1994b)	7-155
Table 7-2. Input Parameters Used in the IEUBK Model Meat Consumption Rate by Age in the IEUBK model Adapted from (USEPA, 1994b)	7-155
Table 7-3. Fish Ingestion Rates (grams/day) Used to Assess Risk for Lead and other Chemicals	7-156
Table 7-4. Percentages of Child Fish Consumption Rates for Consumers of Fish	7-157
Table 7-5. Input Parameters Used for the EPA Adult Lead Model	7-160
Table 7-6. Adult Lead Model Baseline Blood Lead and Geometric Standard Deviations	7-160
Table 8-1. Composite risks for consumption of fish contaminated with radionuclides from the Columbia River Basin for the general public and CRITFC's member Tribes	8-169
Table 9-1. Comparison of range concentrations of sum of DDE (o,p' & p,p') in whole body composite fish samples Columbia River Basin.	9-173
Table 9-2. PCB residues in raw agricultural commodities, 1970-76.	9-174
Table 9-3. The declining trends in PCBs in ready-to-eat foods collected in markets of a number	

of US cities	9-174
Table 9-4. The 1976-80 ranges for PCB residues from 547 finfish from the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries	9-175
Table 9-5. Total PCB concentrations in fish tissue from studies reported in the literature from 1978-1994.	9-175
Table 9-6. Concentrations Aroclor 1254 & 1260 in white croaker muscle tissue from California water bodies in the spring of 1994. (Source: Fairey	9-175
Table 9.7. Concentrations of Aroclor 1254 in lake trout from lakes in Michigan during 1978-82	9-175
Table 9-8. Aroclor concentrations in chinook salmon eggs reported for Lake Michigan, Michigan, compared to our study of Aroclors in the chinook salmon eggs.	9-176
Table 9-9. Concentrations of Aroclors 1254 and 1260 in composite samples of fish fillets from Lake Roosevelt, Washington compared concentrations measured in our study of the Columbia River Basin.	9-176
Table 9-10. Concentrations of 2,3,7,8-TCDF in composite samples of fish fillets collected from Lake Roosevelt, Washington in 1994 compared with our 1996-1998 survey of the Columbia River Basin.	9-178
Table 9-11. Lead concentrations in food purchased in five Canadian cities between 1986 - 1988	9-183
Table 9-12. British Columbia monitoring study of mercury concentrations in fish fillet tissue	9-184
Table 9-13. EPA 1984 survey of total mercury concentrations in edible fish tissue, shrimp, and prepared foods.	9-185
Table 9-14. Mercury concentrations from an EPA 1990 - 1995 national survey of fish fillets	9-185
Table 9-15. USGS survey of mercury concentrations in fish tissue from reservoirs and streams in Northern California	9-186
Table 9-16. Mercury concentrations in fish fillets collected in Lake Whatcom and Lake Roosevelt, Washington compared to our study of the Columbia River Basin	9-186
Table 9-17. Selenium concentrations in US infant diet.	9-188

Table 9-18. Concentrations of selenium in fish reported in the literature.	9-188
Table 9-19. Concentrations of zinc in food groups.	9-190
Table 9-20a. Comparison of chemical concentrations in composites samples of whole body largescale sucker.	9-194
Table 9-20b . Comparison of ranges of chemical concentration in composite samples of whole body bridgelip sucker.	9-195
Table 9-21. Comparison of ranges chemical concentrations in composite samples of whole body mountain whitefish.	9-196
Table 9-22. Comparison of ranges of chemical concentrations in whole body channel catfish tissue from our study with the USGS-NCBP database.	9-198
Table 9-23. Comparison of ranges of chemical concentrations in whole body smallmouth bass.	9-199
Table 9-24. Comparison of ranges of chemical concentrations in composite samples of whole body rainbow trout.	9-200
Table 9-25. Comparison of chemical concentrations in chinook salmon fillet with skin.	9-201
Table 9-26. Comparison of chemical concentrations in coho salmon fillet with skin.	9-202
Table 9-27a. Range of chemical concentrations in resident fish tissue samples from our study of the Columbia River Basin, 1996-1998.	9-206
Table 9-27b. Range of chemical concentrations (µg/kg) in anadromous fish tissue samples from our study of the Columbia River Basin.	9-207
Table 10-1 . Percent difference in field duplicate samples from the Columbia River Basin. Fish are listed with study site ID in parentheses.	10-211
Table 10. 2. Comparison of estimated total cancer risks and hazard indices for a hypothetical multiple species diet using data from Table 17 and Table 18 in the CRITFC fish consumption report	10-216
Table 10-3. Estimated Cancer Risks for PCBs Using Different Methods of Calculation.	10-221
Table 10-4. Comparison of Hazard Indices for the Immunological Endpoint Based on Alternative Treatments of Aroclor Data.	10-222
Table 10-5. Comparison of Hazard Quotients and Hazard Indices for the Hepatic Health	

Endpoint Based on Alternative Treatments of DDT, DDD, and DDE Data.	10-223
---	--------

List of Figures

Figure 1-1. Study sites in the Columbia River Basin	1-5
Figure 2-1. Basin-wide average percent lipid in fish collected from the Columbia River Basin.. .	2-19
Figure 2-2. Basin-wide average concentrations of total pesticides in composite fish tissue collected from Columbia River Basin.	2-21
Figure 2-3. Percent contribution of DDT structural analogs to total DDT concentration in whole body largescale sucker.. . . .	2-25
Figure 2-4a. Study site specific concentrations of p,p' DDE in white sturgeon individual fish tissue samples in the Columbia River Basin.	2-27
Figure 2-4b. Study site specific concentrations of p,p DDE in largescale sucker composite fish tissue samples from the Columbia River Basin.	2-28
Figure 2-4c. Study site specific concentrations of p,p DDE in mountain whitefish composite fish tissue samples from the Columbia River Basin.. . . .	2-28
Figure 2-5a. Study site concentrations of Aroclor 1254 in white sturgeon individual fish tissue samples from the Columbia River Basin.	2-30
Figure 2-5b. Study site specific concentrations of Aroclor 1260 in white sturgeon individual fish tissue samples from the Columbia River Basin.	2-30
Figure 2-6a. Concentration of Aroclor 1254 in largescale sucker composite fish tissue samples from the Columbia River Basin.	2-31
Figure 2-6b. Concentration of Aroclor 1260 in largescale sucker composite fish tissue samples from the Columbia River Basin.	2-31
Figure 2-7a. Concentration of Aroclor 1254 in mountain whitefish composite fish tissue samples from the Columbia River Basin.	2-32
Figure 2-7b. Concentration of Aroclor 1260 in mountain whitefish composite fish tissue samples from the Columbia River Basin.	2-32
Figure 2-8a. Percent contribution of dioxin-like PCB congeners in mountain whitefish composite fillet samples from the Columbia River Basin.	2-34
Figure 2-8b. Percent contribution of dioxin-like PCB congeners in spring chinook salmon composite fillet samples from the Columbia River Basin.	2-34

Figure 2-9. Study site average dioxin-like PCB congeners in white sturgeon and mountain whitefish samples from the Columbia River Basin.	2-35
Figure 2-10. Correlation of basin-wide average concentrations of Aroclors 1242,1254,1260 (x axis) with dioxins like PCB congeners (y axis).	2-35
Figure 2-11. Study site average concentrations of chlorinated dioxins and furans in mountain whitefish, white sturgeon, and largescale sucker from study sites in the Columbia River Basin. Study sites are described in Table 1-1).	2-37
Figure 2-12. Percent contribution of each chlorinated dioxin and furan in largescale sucker. Basin-wide average of 23 composite whole body fish tissue samples.	2-37
Figure 2-13a. Basin-wide average percent of individual metals in largescale sucker fillets.	
Figure 2-13b. Basin-wide percent of individual metals in spring chinook salmon fillets.	2-41
Figure 2-14a. Site specific concentrations of arsenic in white sturgeon individual fish tissue samples from the Columbia River Basin.	2-45
Figure 2-14b. Site specific concentration of arsenic in largescale sucker composite fish tissue samples from the Columbia River Basin.	2-46
Figure 2-14c. Site specific concentration of arsenic in mountain whitefish composite fish tissue samples from the Columbia River Basin.	2-46
Figure 2-15a. Study site concentrations of arsenic in spring chinook composite samples from the Columbia River Basin..	2-47
Figure 2-15b. Site specific concentrations of arsenic in steelhead composite fish tissue samples from the Columbia River Basin..	2-47
Figure 2-16a. Site specific concentrations of mercury in white sturgeon fish tissue samples from the Columbia River Basin.	2-49
Figure 2-16b. Site specific concentrations of mercury in largescale sucker composite fish tissue samples from the Columbia River Basin.	2-49
Figure 2-16c. Site specific concentrations of mercury in mountain whitefish composite fish tissue samples from the Columbia River Basin	2-49
Figure 2-17a. Site specific concentrations of mercury in spring chinook salmon composite fish tissue samples from the Columbia River Basin..	2-49

Figure 2-17b. Site specific concentrations of mercury in steelhead composite fish tissue samples from the Columbia River Basin..	2-49
Figure 6-1. Total hazard index versus fish consumption rate for adults.	6-91
Figure 6-2a. Hazard indices for general public adults and children, average fish consumption rate of white sturgeon fillets.	6-95
Figure 6-2b. Hazard indices for CRITFC's member tribal adults and children, average fish consumption rate for white sturgeon fillets.	6-95
Figure 6-2c. Hazard indices for general public adults and children, high fish consumption rate of white sturgeon fillets.	6-95
Figure 6-2d. Hazard indices for CRITFC's member tribal adults and children, high fish consumption rate of white sturgeon fillets..	6-95
Figure 6-3. Adult total non-cancer hazard indices for resident fish species* using basin-wide average data.	6-99
Figure 6-4. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations to non-cancer hazards from consumption of white sturgeon fillet without skin.	6-101
Figure 6-5. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations of non-cancer hazards from consumption of largescale sucker fillets with skin.	6-101
Figure 6-6. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations to non-cancer hazards from consumption of whole body bridgelip sucker.	6-102
Figure 6-7. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations to non-cancer hazards from consumption of rainbow trout fillet with skin.	6-102
Figure 6-8. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations to non-cancer hazards from consumption of walleye fillet with skin..	6-103
Figure 6-9. Percent contribution of basin-wide chemical concentrations to non-cancer hazards from consumption of mountain whitefish fillet with skin.	6-103
Figure 6.10 Adult total non-cancer indices for anadromous fish species..	6-107
Figure 6-11. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations to non-cancer hazards from consumption of spring chinook fillet with skin	6-109
Figure 6-12. Percent contribution of basin-wide chemical concentrations to non-cancer hazards from consumption of coho salmon.	6-109

Figure 6-13. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations to non-cancer hazards from consumption of fall chinook fillet with skin.	6-110
Figure 6-14. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations to non-cancer hazards from consumption of steelhead fillet with skin.	6-110
Figure 6-15. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations to non-cancer hazards from consumption of Pacific lamprey fillet with skin.	6-111
Figure 6-16. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations to non-cancer hazards from consumption of whole body eulachon..	6-111
Figure 6-17. Adult total non-cancer hazard indices across all species..	6-115
Figure 6-18. Comparison of estimated total cancer risks for consumption of white sturgeon across study sites for adults in the general public and CRITFC's member tribes at high consumption rates.	6-119
Figure 6-19. Total cancer risks versus fish consumption rate for adults..	6-120
Figure 6-20. Adult cancer risks for resident fish species.	6-123
Figure 6-21. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations to cancer risk from consumption of white sturgeon fillet without skin	6-126
Figure 6-22. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations to cancer risk from consumption of largescale sucker fillet with skin..	6-126
Figure 6-23. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations to cancer risk from consumption of whole body bridgelip sucker.	6-127
Figure 6-24. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations to cancer risk from consumption of rainbow trout fillet with skin..	6-127
Figure 6-25. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations to cancer risk from consumption of walleye fillet with skin.	6-128
Figure 6-26. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations to cancer risk from consumption of mountain whitefish fillet with skin.	6-128
Figure 6-27. Adult cancer risks for anadromous fish species..	6-131
Figure 6-28. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations to cancer risk from consumption of spring chinook fillet with skin.	6-134

Figure 6-29. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations to cancer risk from consumption of coho salmon fillet with skin.	6-134
Figure 6-30. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations to cancer risk from consumption of fall chinook salmon fillet with skin.	6-135
Figure 6-31. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations to cancer risk from consumption of steelhead fillet with skin.	6-135
Figure 6-32. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations to cancer risk from consumption of Pacific lamprey fillet with skin..	6-136
Figure 6-33. Percent contribution of basin-wide average chemical concentrations to cancer risk from consumption of whole body eulachon..	6-136
Figure 6-34. Adult estimated total cancer risks across all fish species sampled.	6-139
Figure 6-35. Adult total hazard indices for all fish species, with multiple-species diet results. Basin-wide average data.	6-146
Figure 6-36. Adult cancer risks for all species, with multiple-species diet results. Columbia River Basin-wide average chemical concentration data.	6-146
Figure 6-37. Impact of percent inorganic arsenic on total hazard index..	6-148
Figure 6-38. Impact of percent inorganic arsenic on cancer risks.	6-150
Figure 7-1. Sample IEUBK Model for Lead Output Graph.	7-154
Figure 7-2. Predicted blood lead levels for children who consume of fish collected from the Columbia River Basin assuming fish is 16% of dietary meat.	7-157
Figure 7-3. Predicted blood lead levels for children (0-72 months) who consume 101 g/day of fish collected from the Columbia River Basin, 1996-1998.	7-158
Figure 7-4. Predicted fetal blood lead levels with maternal fish ingestion rate of 39.2 g/day with baseline blood lead level at 2.2 µg/dl and GSD = 2.1 µg/dl.	7-161
Figure 7-5. Predicted fetal blood lead level with maternal fish ingestion rate of 39.2 g/day with baseline blood lead level at 1.7 µg/dl and GSD = 1.8 µg/dl.	7-162

Appendix A. Study Design for Assessment of Chemical Contaminants in Fish Consumed by
Four Native American Tribes in the Columbia River Basin
Appendix B. Fish Live Histories
Appendix C. Toxicity Profiles
Appendix D. Summary Statistics by Basin, Tributary, and Site
Appendix E. Chemical Concentrations for Three Detection Limit Rules
Appendix F. Summary of Chemicals Not Detected
Appendix G. Non-cancer Hazard Quotients
Appendix H. Percent Contribution o Non-Cancer
Appendix I. Cancer Risk Values
Appendix J. Percent Contribution to Cancer Risk Values
Appendix K. Radionuclide Data
Appendix L. AED Pesticide Measurement Results
Appendix M. Hazard Indices Across Study Sites
Appendix N. Estimated Cancer Risks by Study Site
Appendix O. Summary of Risk Characterization Results for Resident Species
Appendix P. Summary of Risk Characterization Results for Anadromous Species

Volume 2. Data Appendices
Volume 3. Fish Collection and Processing Forms
Volume 4. Quality Assurance Summary to the Project Final Report
Volume 5. Quality Assurance Project Plan

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge the vision of the Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission, the Yakama Nation, Nez Perce Tribe, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation, and Craig McCormack (Washington Department of Ecology, formerly with EPA) who saw a need to establish a clear understanding of the presence of toxic chemicals in fish consumed from the Columbia River Basin. Their persistence and dedication resulted in a commitment by EPA to complete this study.

The staff and directors of the Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission (Ted Strong, Anne Watanabe, Don Sampson, Paul Lumley, III., Cat Black) are acknowledged for their persistence and commitment beginning with the Columbia River Basin Fish Consumption Survey (CRITFC, 1994) to the completion of this contaminant survey.

EPA is grateful to the many Tribal members who made the fish sampling a major success. As a result of the tremendous help and work of Tribal members and a dedicated EPA/Tribal sampling team, the overall objectives of the project were accomplished. We want to thank the following for their help in the field sampling:

Yakama Nation sampling crews: Eugene Billy, Seymore Billy, Steve Blodgett, Bill Bosch, Jim Dunnigan, Ernst Edwards, Lillian Eneas, Mike George, Gina George, Lee Hannigan, Isaiah Hogan, Joe Hoptowit, Cecil James, Jr., Joe Jay Pinkham III, Jamie Jim, Mark Johnston, James Kiona, Linda Lamebull, George Lee, Beverly Logie, Bobbi Looney, Jr., Donella Miller, Manard Only, Steve Parker, Lee Roy Senator, Brian Saluskin, Vernon Smartlowit, Greg Strom, Ceilia Walsey-Begay, Earl Wesley

Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation: Chris Brun, Mark Fritsch, Jim Griggs, Mick Jennings, Terry Luther, Patty O'Toole, Stanley Simtustus.

Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation: Brian Conner, Craig Contor, Gary James, Mike Jones, Jerry Rowan, Vern Spencer, Brian Zimmerman,

Nez Perce Tribe; John Gibhards, Jay Hesse, Nancy Hoefs, Paul Kucra, Ed Larsen, Donna Powauke,

EPA Sample Collectors and Field Support: Robert Athmann, Tom Davis, Andy Hess, Duane Karna, Andy Osterhaus, Doc Thompson, Philip Wong

Hatcheries Field Support:

Dworshak National Fish Hatchery (USFWS) Bill Miller, Bob Semple; Oxbow Hatchery (IDFG) Julie Hislop; Looking Glass Hatchery (ODFW) Bob Lund; Little White Salmon

National Hatchery (USFWS) Speros Doulos; Dexter Hatchery (ODFW) Gary Jaeger, Tim Wright; Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery (USFWS) Corky Broadus, Dan Davis, Greg Pratschner; Carson National Fish Hatchery (USFWS) Bruce McCloud; Klickitat River Hatchery (WDFW) Ed Anderson; Priest Rapids Hatchery (WDFW) Dan Bozorth, Paul Peterson;

We want to especially thank Lynn Hatcher of the Yakama Nation for his encouragement of tribal staff to participate in the field sampling.

The radionuclide analyses could not have been completed without the help of EPA's National Air and Radiation Laboratory (John Griggs, Tonya Hudson, David Saunders). EPA Region 10's work on this project was facilitated by the project Sample Control Manager Melody Walker as well as the Administrative staff (Mary Moore, Lorraine Swierkos, Sharon Buza, Ofelia Erickson).

EPA Office of Water (Jeff Bigler, Elizabeth Southerland, LeAnn Stahl, Tom Armitage) were responsible for the initial study design and finding the funds for the study. Bill Telliard is recognized for his development of PCB congener Method 1668.

The assistance of the following Region 10 staff was invaluable. Mary Lou Soscia helped move the project into action through her facilitation of the completion of the Memorandum of Agreement with the tribes and EPA. Kellie Kubena is thanked for her work on the background material on chemicals in fish species. Ray Peterson, Matt Gubitosa, Don Matheny, Peter Leinenbach helped to prepare the background maps for the project. Carol Harrison is especially appreciated for the work she did in putting the document together and for her patience with our frequent last minute modifications. Thanks to Rob Pedersen for his help in preparing the data appendices. Thanks to Lon Kissinger for his graphic analysis of the chemical data. We are deeply indebted to Ravi Sanga for all the work he did in completing this report. We also thank Tom Lewandoski for his help on the toxicological profiles. Duane Karna, Michael Watson, and Roseanne Lorenzana are especially appreciated for their peer review of this report.

The Multi-Agency Task Force is acknowledged for their help in designing the study.

CONTRIBUTORS

EPA Region 10

Patricia Cirone
Dana Davoli
Duane Karna
Robert Melton
Rick Poeton
Marc Stifelman
Dave Terpening
Michael Watson
Peggy Knight
Katherine Adams
Roy Araki
Isa Chamberlain
Randy Cummings
Gerald Dodo
Stephanie Le
Kathy Parker
Steve Reimer
Bob Rieck
Tony Morris
Tobi Braverman

Steve Ellis
MCS Environmental, Inc

EVS Consultants
Seattle, Washington

TetraTech Consultants
Bellevue, Washington

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN FISH TISSUE CONTAMINANT STUDY WORKGROUP

Anne Watanabe
Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission
(formerly)

Paul Lumley III
Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission

Catriona (Cat) Black
Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission

Barbara Harper
Yakama Nation (formerly)

Lynn Hatcher
Yakama Nation

Chris Walsh
Yakama Nation Health Center

Silas Whitman
Nez Perce Tribe (formerly)

Rick Eichsteadt
Nez Perce Tribe

Nancy Hoefs
Nez Perce Fisheries

Patti Howard
Nez Perce Tribe (formerly)

Gary James
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian
Reservation

Stuart Harris
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian
Reservation

Patty O'Toole
Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs
Reservation

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ADD	average daily dose of a specific chemical (mg/kg-day)
AFC	average fish consumption
ALM	EPA Adult Lead Model
AT	averaging time for exposure duration (days)
ATSDR	Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry
AVE	average
BCF	bioconcentration factor
BEIR	Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation
BEST	Biomonitoring of Environmental Status and Trends
BKSF	biokinetic slope factor
BW	body weight
C	chemical concentration in fish tissue
CDC	Centers for Disease Control
CF	conversion factor
CSFII	Continuing Survey of Food Intake by Individuals
CSFs	cancer slope factors
CRITFC	Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission
DDE	1,1-dichloro-2,2- <i>bis</i> (p-chlorophenyl)ethylene
DDT	1,1,1-trichloro-2,2- <i>bis</i> (p-chlorophenyl)ethane
DDD	1,1-dichloro-2,2- <i>bis</i> (p-chlorophenyl)ethane
DDMU	1,1- <i>bis</i> (p-chlorophenyl)2 chloro-ethylene
DF	detection frequency
DMA	dimethyarsenic
EF	exposure frequency (days/year)
ED	Exposure duration (years)
ECR _{new}	Excess cancer risk for the new exposure duration
ECR ₇₀	Excess cancer risk estimate for a lifetime exposure duration of 70 years
ED _{new}	Individual exposure duration in years
ED ₇₀	Default lifetime exposure duration of 70 years
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FS	fillet with skin
FW	fillet without skin
GC/AED	Gas Chromatograph/Atomic Emission Detector
GSD	Geometric Standard Deviation
GPS	global positioning system
HEAST	Health Effects Assessment Summary Tables
HFC	high fish consumption
HI	hazard index
HQ	hazard quotient
IEUBK	EPA integrated exposure uptake biokinetic model
IR	ingestion rate
LLD	lower limit of detection
LOAEL	lowest observed adverse effect level

MAX	maximum
MDC	minimum detectable concentration
MF	modifying factor
MIN	minimum
MMA	monomethylarsenic
NA	not applicable
NAERL	National Air and Radiation Environmental Laboratory
NCEA	National Center for Environmental Assessment
NCBP	National Contaminant Biomonitoring Program
NCRP	National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements
ND	not detected
NOAEL	no observable adverse effect level
NS	not sampled
OCDD	Octachlorodibenzo- <i>p</i> -dioxin
OERR	EPA Office of Emergency and Remedial Response
PAHs	polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
PCBs	polychlorinated biphenyls
PSAMP	Puget Sound Ambient Monitoring Program
RfD	reference dose
RPFs	relative potency factors
2,3,7,8-TCDD	2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo- <i>p</i> -dioxin
2,3,7,8 TCDF	2,3,7,8 tetrachlorodibenzo- <i>p</i> -furan
TEC	toxicity equivalence concentration
TEF	toxicity equivalence factor
TRW	EPA Technical Review Workgroup for Lead
UF	uncertainty factors
WB	whole body
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USGS	United States Geological Survey

		Bq	one radioactive disintegration per second
Units			
ng/kg	nanograms per kilogram (ppt)		
µg/dl	micrograms per deciliter		
µg/kg	micrograms per kilogram		
	(ppb)		
g/day	grams per day		
mg/kg	milligram per kilogram (ppm)		
kg	kilogram		
kg/g	kilogram per gram		
mg/kg-day	milligram per kilogram-day		

